



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/655,572

09/04/2003

Mark Dane

H0644-700719

6428

37462 7590 06/16/2008
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
ONE MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER

MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/16/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@ll-a.com
gengelso@ll-a.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/655,572	Applicant(s) DANE ET AL.	
	Examiner GABRIELLE MCCORMICK	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/27/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the amendment filed on March 27, 2008.
2. Claim 1 has been amended.
3. Claim 6 has been canceled.
4. Claims 1-5 and 7-16 are currently pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 27, 2008 has been considered. An initialed copy of the Form 1449 is enclosed herewith. Included with the March 27, 2008 IDS are the NPL documents previously unavailable for review. The Examiner thanks the Applicant for providing copies of the NPL.

Previous Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The previous rejection of claim 6 is withdrawn as a result of Applicant's cancellation of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-5 and 7-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0069080 hereinafter referred to as "Roy").
9. Roy discloses a web based system for cataloging, inventorying, selecting, measuring, valuing and matching "Intellectual Capital Skills" using networked computers and where the data is stored in a relational database. The system stores "Intellectual Capital codes" that are used to create a job description. (P [0038]). The system is accessible to various users, including clients (employers) and recruiters (i.e., a requirements specialist. Note: The term "recruiter" is understood to be descriptive of the field of employment that specializes in matching candidates and positions, therefore, a recruiter is a requirements specialist). (P [0128]). This provides the teaching that either a client or a recruiter may determine, view, receive, develop or create any part of the invention.
10. **Claim 1:** Roy discloses
 - *developing a first job description, the first job description comprising a first set of components;* (P [0042] and Fig. 3(a))
 - *storing the first set of components in a database;* (P [0039])
 - *creating a second job description having a second set of components, at least one of which is selected from the first set of components stored in the database.* (P [0038]: The "Intellectual Capital codes" can be used to create multiple job descriptions. Fig. 3(a) discloses a template in which multiple job descriptions would use the common components (fields of the template) for data entry.)
11. Roy further discloses that a client can edit the position skills by adding or deleting skills as needed for a position. (P[0134]). Though Roy does not explicitly disclose that a second job description is created based upon the first job description, it is obvious that in editing a first job description by adding or deleting skills, a second job description is created. Further, it is obvious to use a previous job description when creating a new one by editing the former. Roy would be motivated to do so to build on its system of providing uniform and consistent terminology that allows for an accurate and systematic search and comparison of candidate skills. (P[0007]).

Art Unit: 3629

12. Roy also provides the motivation to create a second, edited job description in response to the matching results. It is obvious to create a revised job description in order to increase or decrease a pool of suitable applicants. For example, if the first job description results in a small pool of applicants, by editing the description to alter the requirements, the pool can be increased.
13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included creating a second job description based on the first, in the system of Roy for the motivation of efficiently creating job descriptions that use consistent terminology that aids in matching and to allow control over the size of a pool of applicants through changing the skill requirements of a first description to create a second one.
14. **Claim 2:** Roy discloses determining the first set of components (P [0035]) and a requirements specialist (P[0128]: a recruiter).
15. **Claim 3:** Roy discloses selecting an Intellectual Capital code (P [0038]: position requirements are created) and displaying to a client (Fig. 3(a) is a screen shot that would be displayed to a client accessing through the system illustrated in Fig. 1).
16. **Claim 4:** Roy discloses storing in a relational database. (P [0039]).
17. **Claims 5, 7 and 9:** Roy discloses displaying the selection to a client and a recruiter using a computer system. (Fig. 3(a) is a screen shot that would be displayed to a client and a recruiter accessing through the system illustrated in Fig. 1).
18. **Claim 8:** Roy discloses a recruiter interacting with a client. (P [0134]).
19. **Claims 10 and 11:** Roy discloses an educational requirement and a task (skill). (P [0053]).
20. **Claim 12:** Roy discloses a requirements specialist (P[0128]: a recruiter) receiving hiring needs and determining a job description. (P [0042]: the job description is created using the menu of skills required for the submitted job position).
21. **Claims 13 and 14:** Roy discloses displaying job descriptions to a client and a recruiter. (Fig. 3(a) is a screen shot that would be displayed to a client and a recruiter accessing through the system illustrated in Fig. 1).

22. **Claim 15:** Roy discloses storing in a database (P [0039]) and selecting codes from the database. (P [0038]).
23. **Claim 16:** Roy discloses an educational requirement and a task (skill) (P [0053]) where the skills are selected from a database (P [0038]).

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's argument with respect to claim 1 has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as detailed above.
25. Applicant's arguments filed March 27, 2008 regarding claims 2-3, 5, 7-8 and 12-16 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Roy discloses the use of a "requirements specialist" (P[0128]: the system is used by various types of users, including "a prospect, a client, a **recruiter**, a system manager, and the system administrator"). The term "recruiter" is understood to be descriptive of the field of employment that specializes in matching candidates and positions, therefore, a recruiter is a requirements specialist.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3629

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabrielle McCormick whose telephone number is 571-270-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (5:30 - 4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/John G. Weiss/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629